ORIGINAL

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

NOV 3 2000

In the Matter of)	DEFICE OF THE SECRETARY	飲物
Federal-State Joint Board on)	CC Docket No. 96-45	
Universal Service)		
Comments on the Rural Task Force)		
Recommendation – FCC-00J-3)		

VALOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS ENTERPRISES, LLC'S COMMENTS ON THE RURAL TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION TO THE FEDERAL-STATE JOINT BOARD ON UNIVERSAL SERVICE

Valor Telecommunications Enterprises, LLC (VALOR), by its attorneys, hereby comments on the Recommendation of the Rural Task Force (RTF) to the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service concerning high cost universal service support for rural carriers. Specifically, VALOR's comments focus on the RTF's recommendation concerning support for rural exchanges that have been sold or transferred. VALOR is a newly formed holding company whose wholly-owned subsidiary operating companies have purchased various exchanges in Oklahoma, New Mexico and Texas from GTE Southwest Incorporated (GTE). The study areas in New Mexico and Texas are classified as rural. The recommendation of the RTF, therefore, will have a direct effect on the operations of VALOR.

In the Recommendation, the RTF states that it has concerns that Section 54.305 of the Commission's current rules, which provides that per-line support for a transferred exchange remains equal to the per-line amount of support that the seller was eligible to receive prior to the transfer, limits the ability of acquiring carriers to make new investments to upgrade their networks. Accordingly, the RTF recommends that the FCC establish a "safety valve mechanism"

list of Orentz man 074

for rural carriers which acquire access lines due to sale or merger that would provide some additional universal service support for new investments. In developing a safety valve mechanism, the RTF agreed that certain principles should be applied including the principle that a mere transfer of ownership should not result in an increase in support. However, where meaningful new post-transaction investments are made to enhance the infrastructure and improve service, support to high cost rural exchanges involved in sale/transfer transactions should be provided.

The RTF also provides an illustration of how a safety valve mechanism would work. As shown in the RTF's illustration, the safety valve universal service support would be additional high cost loop (HCL) support, over and above the support transferable to the study area under the provisions of Section 54.305. According to the illustration, at the end of the first year of operations a study area HCL "expense adjustment" would be calculated (the "index year expense adjustment"). At the end of each subsequent year, a study area HCL "expense adjustment" would be calculated and compared to the "index year expense adjustment." Fifty percent of any positive difference between the subsequent year "expense adjustment" and the "index year expense adjustment" would be designated as the safety valve adjustment and would be provided as universal service support to the study area in addition to amounts available under Section 54.305. However, the sum of the safety valve adjustments for all study areas would not exceed 5 percent of the indexed HCL fund cap for Rural Carriers.

VALOR supports the RTF's general recommendation that a safety valve should be developed to allow acquiring rural carriers to receive universal service support to offset the infrastructure improvements made after the sale or transfer of lines. As indicated by the RTF, Section 54.305 of the Commission's current rules limits the ability of acquiring carriers to make

the necessary investments to upgrade networks and to ensure that customers in rural areas have access to services that are comparable to those in urban areas. Similar concerns with Section 54.305 were recognized by the Joint Board in its recent Recommended Decision concerning hold-harmless universal service support, in which the Joint Board stated that the rule has "negative consequences" with regard to transfers of exchanges between carriers that are not both receiving support based on the forward-looking mechanism because it "prevents the acquiring carrier from receiving an amount of support related to the costs of providing supported services in the transferred exchange."

VALOR, which purchased predominantly small, rural exchanges, with low teledensity and high costs in the states of Texas and New Mexico, is a case in point. Although Section 54.305 limits VALOR's high cost support to the amount received by GTE, VALOR is committed to not only maintaining universal service but also to providing new technology and services to these remote exchanges at just and reasonable rates. For example, VALOR's planned capital expenditures for the first five years of operation total approximately \$83 million in New Mexico, to improve existing services, support future growth and deploy new enhanced and advanced services. Specifically, VALOR is investing in local loop infrastructure that will enhance the quality of basic local exchange service and allow VALOR to provide new service by freeing up copper pairs and allowing the removal of small pair-gain devices that currently slow dial-up Internet traffic. VALOR also is upgrading the hardware and software in switches that are currently incapable of supporting custom local area signaling services (CLASS), such as Caller ID, call waiting, call forwarding, and three-way calling.

Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96-45, Recommended Decision, FCC 00J-1, at ¶20, released June 30, 2000 (Recommended Decision).

VALOR is replacing, where necessary, non-fiber facilities and upgrading fiber optic terminals to accommodate high-bandwidth interoffice transport and high-speed data and other enhanced and advanced services such as Internet service and digital subscriber line (DSL) service. VALOR also is deploying modem pools and routers to support local dial-up Internet Access, and, if necessary, ATM switches to support higher bandwidth services.

Similarly, in Texas, VALOR is upgrading central office switches in order to provide CLASS services within eighteen months of closing. VALOR committed to deploy DSL service to ten exchanges within eighteen months of closing and, upon receiving a minimum number of orders, to provide DSL service (or equivalent broadband technology) to any of its other exchanges within fifteen months of receiving a bona fide request. VALOR also committed to provide dial-up Internet access to every exchange within eighteen months of closing.

The RTF's recommendation, which would allow VALOR to recover some portion of these investments, is consistent with the principle that consumers in rural and high-cost areas should have access to telecommunications and information services at rates that are reasonably comparable to those in urban areas. A mechanism, like the one proposed by the RTF, also would help to alleviate the "negative consequences" of Section 54.305 identified by the Joint Board namely, that acquiring carriers are prevented from receiving an amount of support related to the costs of providing supported services in the transferred exchange. The RTF's recommendation also is in keeping with the requirements of the Communications Act in ensuring adequate universal service support for rural areas. VALOR believes, however, that the recommendation may not allow adequate recovery of new investments and requests that the Joint Board evaluate whether the fifty percent limitation and the five percent cap on the safety valve adjustment are consistent with the requirement of ensuring adequate universal service support for rural areas.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, VALOR urges the Joint Board to adopt the RTF's recommendation and develop a mechanism that allows for additional universal service support for new investments made in connection with acquired lines. VALOR further requests that the Joint Board consider whether any differing treatment following the sale of exchanges is warranted.

Respectfully submitted,

VALOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS

ENTERPRISES, LLC

Benjamin H. Dickens, Jr.

Mary J. Sisak

Its Attorneys

Blooston, Mordkofsky, Jackson & Dickens 2120 L Street, NW

Suite 300

Washington, DC 20037

(202) 659-0830

Dated: November 3, 2000

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Althea B. Pierce, do hereby certify that on this, the 3rd day of November, 2000, a copy of the foregoing comments was served by first class United States mail, postage prepaid or hand-delivered, to the parties listed below:

The Honorable Susan Ness Commissioner, FCC Joint Board Chair Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW, Room 8-B115H Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Harold Furchtgott-Roth Commissioner Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW, Rm. 8-Bll5H Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Gloria Tristani Commissioner Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W., Rm. 8-Bll5H Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Laska Schoenfelder Commissioner, State Joint Board Chair South Dakota Public Utilities Commission State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Street Pierre, SD 57501-5070

The Honorable Martha Hogerty Public Counsel Missouri Office of Public Counsel 301 West High St. Suite 250 Truman Building P.O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, MO 65102

The Honorable Bob Rowe Commissioner Montana Public Service Commission 1701 Prospect Avenue P.O. Box 202601 Helena, MT 59620-2601 The Honorable Patrick H. Wood, III Chairman Texas Public Utility Commission 1701 North Congress Avenue P.O. Box 13326 Austin, TX 78711-3326

The Honorable Nanette G. Thompson Chair Regulatory Commission of Alaska 1016 West Sixth Avenue, Suite 400 Anchorage, AK 99501-1693

Rowland Curry Chief Engineer Texas Public Utility Commission 1701 North Congress Avenue P.O. Box 13326 Austin, TX 78701-3326

Greg Fogleman Economic Analyst Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd Gerald Gunter Bldg. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Mary E. Newmeyer Federal Affairs Advisor Alabama Public Service Commission 100 N. Union Street, Ste. 800 Montgomery, AL 36104

Joel Shifman Senior Advisor Maine Public Utilities Commission 242 State Street State House Station 18 Augusta ME 04333-0018 Peter Bluhm Director of Policy Research Vermont Public Service Board Drawer 20 112 State St., 4th Floor Montpieller, VT 05620-2701

Charlie Bolle Policy Advisor Nevada Public Utilities Commission 1150 E. Williams Street Carson City, NV 89701-3105

Carl Johnson Telecom Policy Analyst New York Public Service Commission 3 Empire State Plaza Albany, NY 12223-1350

Lori Kenyon Common Carrier Specialist Regulatory Commission of Alaska 1016 West 6th Ave, Suite 400 Anchorage, AK 99501

Susan Stevens Miller Assistant General Counsel Maryland Public Service Commission 16th Floor, 6 Paul Street Baltimore, MD 21202-6806

Tom Wilson
Economist
Washington Utilities & Transportation
Commission
1300 Evergreen Park Drive, SW
P.O. Box 47250
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

International Transcription Service 1231 20th Street, NW 1232 Washington, DC 20037 (Diskette copy) Philip McClelland Senior Assistant Consumer Advocate PA Office of Consumer Advocate 555 Walnut Street Forum Place, 5th Floor Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923

Barbara Meisenheimer Consumer Advocate Missouri Office of Public Counsel 301 West High St., Suite 250 Truman Building P.O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Earl Poucher Legislative Analyst Office of the Public Counsel 111 West Madison, Rm. 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Ann Dean Assistant Director Maryland Public Service Commission 16th Floor, 6 Paul Street Baltimore, MD 21202-6806

David Dowds
Public Utilities Supervisor
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oaks Blvd.
Gerald Gunter Bldg.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Sheryl Todd Accounting Policy Division Common Carrier Bureau Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW, Room 5-B540 Washington, DC 20554

Althea B. Pierce